

harvest because 40 percent of all adult men in our distressed inner cities did not work in a year that was studied recently, while a significant number worked only sporadically or part time.

Today, half of all the residents of the distressed neighborhoods in our big cities live below the federally defined poverty threshold. In 1993, that was \$14,763 for a family of four. The reason for that is, in part, we have said to businesses, we have a regulatory framework that really provides incentives for you to get out of here, for you to go to that green field in suburbia, go to a new place, leave the city alone.

We provided incentives. We have not done it purposely. We have not done it knowingly. But we have provided real incentives for people to leave the urban centers of America. And, when we leave them empty we leave the people there empty. We leave them in peril. We leave them in distress. We leave them in despair. And ultimately we leave some of them in a situation from which they can never escape.

There are those who say, "Well, you don't want to have a standard for safety or an environment that is lower in the city than it is in some other area. There has to be environmental justice." I believe in environmental justice. I believe everyone should have an equal chance at the good life that we want to enjoy. But I believe that when our requirements are shortening the lives of individuals instead of extending them, when our requirements are pulling the rug out from under the health of our population, we ought to think carefully about whether or not they are having the right effect.

I do not have the studies in my hand right now, but I think virtually all of us in this Chamber understand that when we have looked at health statistics people who are employed tend to be healthier than people who are unemployed, and people who are employed tend to be safer than people who are unemployed. There is very little that is more dangerous in an employment setting in this country than there is to be standing unemployed on the street corners of some of our urban centers.

I believe we ought to look hard at the way in which regulation has drawn a red line around the core of America's cities, the way regulation has basically said, "Do not invest here. Do not produce here. Do not do business here. You cannot get a job here." I think we ought to say to ourselves, let us allow these cities to make an evaluation. When they come to a conclusion that the general well-being of the people—when they come to the conclusion that the health and safety of the inner-city residents—would be benefited by a waiver, let us let them apply. And let us give the agency the authority to grant that waiver application, so we can bring jobs and opportunity and hope back to the center of our cities.

I believe one of the next items which we will be moving toward in the debate here in the U.S. Senate will be an item

which is referred to as welfare reform. We desperately need welfare reform. But, frankly, as much as we need welfare reform we need opportunity for individuals, because we are going to ask people to go to work and we are going to expect them to go to work. But how can we ask people in our inner cities to go to work, how can we expect them to go to work, if we continue to develop a regulatory framework which redlines the inner city and says there cannot be jobs here, there cannot be opportunity here?

Mr. President, I believe it is time for us to grant relief to the urban centers, to give them a level playing field, to give them a chance to attract business and industry that is consistent with the health and safety, the longevity, and the security of the residents of that area. Our regulatory framework has not served them well.

They have paid the higher prices that we have all talked about in the last few weeks, talking about regulation here in this Chamber. But they have also paid a tremendously higher price than just the increased cost of goods that come from regulation. They have paid the price of joblessness and they have paid the price of hopelessness. They have paid the price of looking into the eyes of their young people who have no ambition because they cannot see an opportunity in their neighborhood. That is a substantially greater price than the \$600 billion a year that it is estimated that regulation costs us in America. Oh, yes, they have paid their share of the \$600 billion. But the opportunity costs—in the very heart of American urban centers has been a tremendous opportunity cost, and it is one which we can ill-afford to ignore.

So I rise this evening in the midst of the debate on regulatory reform to say we must recognize the unique circumstances of American cities. We must give these neighborhoods at the core of America, the mature cities of America, the opportunity to have relief when, as a matter of fact, the imposition of regulations now achieves a purpose absolutely contrary to the purpose for which the law was enacted which provided for regulations. It shortens lives, impairs safety, ruins health, and destroys opportunity.

It is time for the Urban Regulatory Relief Zone Act, and I hope we have an opportunity to include that in our dealings with regulatory relief during our deliberations this week.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for about the last couple of hours, 2½ hours, a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been negotiating on S. 343, the regulatory reform bill. Those negotiations are still underway. So as not to waste time, I have suggested to the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, that we now proceed to consideration of S. 21, which is the Bosnian resolution, and I am hopeful we can reach that agreement and then we would continue on S. 21 and hopefully finish it tomorrow. That would give the Members who are in the negotiations on S. 343 all day tomorrow to see if they can come to some agreement on three or four important issues.

I also have asked consent that, if they reach an agreement, that I can come back to S. 343 and maybe reach some agreement on completion of that bill or complete that measure. So as soon as I hear from the Democratic leader I can advise my colleagues on the schedule for the balance of the evening.

If we cannot get the agreement, then we will come back on S. 343. There are a number of amendments that can be offered tonight, including the pending amendment by the Senator from Missouri. Senator ASHCROFT has an amendment pending. So if we cannot reach an agreement, we will come back on S. 343 tonight and the Senator's amendment will be the pending amendment, as I understand it.

There are other amendments that can be offered tonight on S. 343, so I am not at liberty to say whether or not there will be votes. But we will advise our colleagues as soon as we can.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there has been extensive consultation between the distinguished majority leader and the Democratic leader, and we do have a unanimous-consent request to propound.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 343, be temporarily laid aside; that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 21; and that the Senate turn to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, and it is certainly not my intention to object. Let me make one observation and note a couple of concerns, as we propound the second part of this request.

The observation is this: those who are engaged in trying to work through the remaining differences on the regulation reform bill reported to me just moments ago that real progress has been made this afternoon. I think that we have been able to report progress from time to time.

I think in all sincerity, some effort has been made on both sides to continue to narrow the differences, and we made significant progress over the course of the last several hours. The time that has been spent since about 3 o'clock this afternoon has been well spent.

As it relates to this resolution, I think the recommendation made by the majority leader and the majority whip is a good one. I think laying the bill aside will accommodate the negotiations, and I think that it is safe to assume that we are going to continue to make progress over the course of the next couple of days. We certainly do not relegate any rights to continue to object to closure on the legislation, should we find that progress has not been sufficient. But I think we need to recognize that, indeed, efforts are being made on both sides to try to accommodate the concerns. It is in that context that we want to allow that process to continue.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we certainly appreciate the comments of the distinguished Democratic leader.

I further ask unanimous consent then that the Senate resume S. 343 after the disposition of S. 21, as amended, if amended, and no call for the regular order serve to displace S. 21, except one made by the majority leader after notification of the minority leader, and if a call for the regular order is made, there be 1 hour for debate to be equally divided in the usual form to be followed by the third cloture vote on the Dole-Johnston substitute, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, again, reserving the right to object, now I simply want to state the two concerns I mentioned a moment ago. First, we have an understanding that over the course of tomorrow morning and early afternoon that there be no votes on amendments or on the resolution itself. A number of Senators have been invited down to the White House to discuss this matter. I think it would be very helpful if that discussion can take place prior to the time we are called upon to make any decisions.

Second, should we find the need to come back to S. 21, it would be very helpful if we had plenty of notice. The majority leader and the majority whip have both indicated that, indeed, it would be their desire to give us plenty of notice.

So it is with those two understandings that we have no objection and encourage Senators to comply with this unanimous-consent agreement and

get on with the debate relating to the Dole resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the entire request proposed?

Mr. LOTT. It has been propounded, and if the Chair would like to go ahead and do the ruling, I have one further comment I would like to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the entire unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Does he yield for the purpose of—

Mr. LOTT. First, I was not aware that the Senator had a problem that he wanted to discuss with the minority leader. While that is being done, I would like to respond to a couple of points that the minority leader made.

First, as is always the custom, the majority leader would certainly give notice to the other side, to the minority leader, before any votes would occur. That is always done. Certainly, they would give them the usual courtesy that would be expected in that regard.

Second, I know, also, that the majority leader—while I have not discussed it with him—would want to honor any request for consideration of a meeting that might be occurring on this particular matter with the administration. So I know that the minority leader has already been assured of that. I would like to reconfirm that.

Also, I would like to note, before the Chair rules, that I have been notified that we do not expect any more recorded votes tonight. The majority leader has sent that word. We had discussed that earlier with him and with the minority leader. So the Members should be on notice that there will be no more recorded votes tonight.

I have no further requests. I thank the minority leader for his indulgence. I would like to see if we can get a ruling on the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to notify the membership that if this agreement cannot be reached, it would be the intent of the leader to go on with the pending legislation, and then we could expect additional recorded votes tonight. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I was not aware of the concern of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin with regard to the regulatory reform bill. We have an hour prior to the time we would go to the third cloture motion under this unanimous consent agreement. He would like to be protected to offer a nongermane amendment relating to a sense-of-the-Senate resolution prior to that time. I think if we could accommodate the Senator from Wisconsin, perhaps we could accommodate this unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in view of this development and seeing the Senator from North Carolina seeking recognition, while some further discussion takes place, I will withhold that unanimous consent request for now and yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

#### THE ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST BOSNIA

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, my reaction to this agreement which may soon be entered into is: At long last. On the first day that the Senate this year accepted bills and resolutions to be introduced, this resolution was introduced by the distinguished majority leader with some of the rest of us as cosponsors. The Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am chairman, has not acted on this resolution, at the specific request of the majority leader and others. But I am delighted that finally we are confronting the questions that have been raised about the delay in the resolution.

In short, Mr. President, it is high time for the Senate to acknowledge what is already perfectly clear to any objective observer: The U.N. peacekeeping effort in Bosnia is an abject failure.

The Bosnian Serbs have certainly known this for a long time, as has the beleaguered Bosnian Muslim government. Yet, the United Nations persists in a policy that, at best, has given the appearance of action while, in fact, allowing the slow-motion genocide of Bosnian Muslims.

Lest the President of the United States need reminding, along with the leaders of our European allies, Bosnia was recognized as an independent nation 3 years ago. Commensurate with that status is the explicit right of self-defense. For 3 years, the Bosnian Serbs have pursued an aggressive campaign, aided and abetted by the Government of Serbia. Irrefutable evidence, such as the integrated air defense of these two brutal forces, demonstrates that this is truly a war of aggression being waged by Serbia. How any democratic government can continue to justify the arms embargo against Bosnia on either moral or legal grounds escapes me. It absolutely escapes me.

So-called safe areas are being overrun, U.N. peacekeepers have been taken hostage, humanitarian assistance convoys are either blocked or being looted by Bosnian Serb fighters, and Sarajevo airport has been closed for 3 months. Despite this deteriorating situation, the U.S. Government persists in supporting the illusion of peacekeeping—as if there is any peace to keep in that part of the world. Most recently, President Clinton has stated his intention to spend an additional \$95 million on the U.N. so-called rapid reaction force in order to perpetuate this failed policy. Under the current rules